All Participants:  (1) <u>Manuel L. Barbee</u> .	Application No.	Applicant(s)
All Participants:  (1) <u>Manuel L. Barbee</u> .	10/635,420	KUBITZ, CARL
All Participants:  (1) <u>Manuel L. Barbee</u> .	Examiner	Art Unit
(1) <u>Manuel L. Barbee</u> .	Manuel L. Barbee	2857
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Status of Application:	
(O) Develd I I aglicence	(3)	
(2) <u>Donald J. Lenkszus</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>5 December 2005</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  Mr. Lenkszus confirmed that he had sent no response to the Office Action mailed on 3 May 2005.		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
	Marc S. H SUPERVISORY PATE TECHNOLOGY CE	NT EXAMINER
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/A	Applicant's Representative Signature	gnature – if appropriate)